

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
OpenSIUC

Research Papers

Graduate School

12-2011

Woody Biomass: A Renewable Resource for Southern Illinois

Alison M. Britt

Southern Illinois University - Carbondale, brittam@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp

Recommended Citation

Britt, Alison M., "Woody Biomass: A Renewable Resource for Southern Illinois" (2011). *Research Papers*. Paper 160.
http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/gs_rp/160

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Papers by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

WOODY BIOMASS: A RENEWABLE RESOURCE FOR SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

By

Alison Mae Britt

B.S., Southern Illinois University Carbondale, 2008

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Science

Department of Agribusiness Economics
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
December 2011

RESEARCH PAPER APPROVAL

WOODY BIOMASS: A RENEWABLE RESOURCE FOR SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

By

ALISON MAE BRITT

A Research Paper Submitted in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Masters of Science

in the field of Agribusiness Economics

Approved by:

Silvia Secchi, Chair

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
November 7, 2011

AN ABSTRACT OF THE RESEARCH PAPER OF

ALISON MAE BRITT, for the Masters of Science degree in AGRIBUSINESS ECONOMICS, presented on NOVEMBER 2011, at Southern Illinois University Carbondale.

TITLE: WOODY BIOMASS: A RENEWABLE RESOURCE FOR SOUTHERN ILLINOIS

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Silvia Secchi

Buildup of greenhouse gasses in the earth's atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide, is contributing to an increase and variability of the earth's temperature. Buildup of carbon dioxide can cause gaseous sulfur and nitrogen oxides to form and they can pollute soils, rivers, and bodies of water. Since the buildup of the carbon dioxide affects the soils, rivers, and water supply, it also can lead to an issue with national security, development and economic growth issues; therefore, utilities, government agencies, and environmental groups are looking for clean ways to produce electricity. One of these clean ways is to cofire biomass with coal to produce electricity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Abstract	i
List of Tables	iii
List of Figures	v
Research	
Introduction	1
Background.....	2
Supporting Literature	6
Process.....	12
Data	13
Cost Analysis	19
Conclusion	21
Literature Cited	22
Appendix	
Tables	25
Figures.....	36
VITA	42

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Table 1:	19
Table 2:	19
Table 3:	25
Table 4	25
Table 5: Southern Illinois Region	34
Table 6: Southern Illinois Region	26
Table 7: Illinois Claypan Region	27
Table 8: Illinois Claypan Region	27
Table 9: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region.....	28
Table 10: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region.....	28
Table 11: Southern Illinois Region	37
Table 12: Illinois Claypan Region	29
Table 13: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region.....	30
Table 14: Southern Illinois Region Oak/Hickory Private Ownership Group	30
Table 15: Southern Illinois Region Maple/Beech/Birch Private Ownership Group.....	31
Table 16: Illinois Claypan Region Oak/Hickory Private Ownership Group.....	31
Table 17: Illinois Claypan Region Maple/Beech Birch Private Ownership Group	40
Table 18: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region Oak/Hickory Private Ownership Group	32
Table 19: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region Maple/Beech/Birch Private Ownership Group	33
Table 20: Southern Illinois Region MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon Production Available	33
Table 21: Illinois Claypan Region MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon Production Available	34

Table 22: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon Production Available	34
Table 23: Fossil Fuel Usage in Illinois for Energy Production	35

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>FIGURE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Figure 1: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois	36
Figure 2: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois	37
Figure 3: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois	46
Figure 4: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois	47
Figure 5: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois	40
Figure 6: Average Feedstock Demand Prices.....	41

Introduction

What are your concerns about today's environmental issues that are constantly on your mind? For many Americans, worrying constantly about today's energy demand, has become the norm. So what shall we do about our rising concern about the rising energy demand? We know for a fact that our resources that we use for energy are running out, maybe not presently are they running out, but that will definitely run out sooner than we think. Another concern with the energy demand is the pollution we are causing by burning fossil fuels and their carbon emissions. One project that is being looked into is cofiring woody biomass with coal for the production of energy. Since firing woody biomass alone for the production of cellulosic ethanol is too expensive and not feasible, we are hoping to decrease the amount of carbon emissions released from firing coal alone.

So we are after what it would take to cofire coal and woody biomass together for the production of energy, and more specifically what it is going to take to entice Southern Illinois landowners to participate in the program. Some variables that we will be looking at are the carbon emissions released from cofiring coal and woody biomass together, the cost to harvest woody biomass stalks, the cost associated with the transportation of the woody biomass to the firing plant and the cost associated with the removal of the waste (ash) created from cofiring woody biomass with coal, and the population of maple, beech, birch, ash, hickory, and oak trees. Some of the sources that the data will be pulled from are the National Woodland Owners Survey, United States

Department of Agriculture's Forest Inventory Database Online, and the Carbon Online Estimator.

Background

Biomass is a renewable energy resource of organic non fossil material, and can be anything from waste wood material or crop residues to herbaceous and woody crops. These can specifically be grown to be burned with fossil fuels. Biomasses can be used for energy production in coal fired electricity generation (cofiring) as well as in transportation fuel production (cellulosic ethanol). When biomass is burned, it produces less ash than the amount of ash produced from firing coal, and since woody biomass would add to the amount of energy produced from cofiring coal with woody biomass, less coal would be used, thus creating less waste ash, and, in the long run, would save the power plant the cost the removing the waste. However, it generally has lower Btu's, and if you cofire it in boilers built for coal it creates problems with the slag/.Cofiring biomass is also an efficient way for society to reduce the level of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere (Nienow, S., K. T., McNamara, A. R Gillespie,. and P. V Preckel. 1999). Instead of using fossil fuels in electricity and heat production, using biomass would cost less and provide larger carbon dioxide reductions per unit of biomass rather than substitution biomasses for diesel fuel and gasoline in automobiles.

Utilities are interested in cofiring biomass; however, they know very little about the cost associated with cofiring biomasses and are unaware of how to

start the programs for cofiring (Nienow, S. et al 1.999). However, utilizing woody biomass to produce energy is not a new idea. In the late 19th century, the majority of the energy produced came from wood combustion, but from 1870 to 1970 fossil fuels (coal, oil, and gas) became the primary sources of energy since their cost was lower and they were more readily accessible. Gas and oil prices soared in the late 1970's which prompted the Department of Energy to once again look into utilizing biomass for energy production. In 1978 Congress passed the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act. This act provided incentives to co-generation and small power production facilities.

Since fuel shortages have not happened as expected, environmental concerns with the use of fossil fuels have arose and prompted the re-examination of alternative fuels. The Department of Energy co-funded feasibility studies of ten different biomass programs around the country to assess the commercial viability and environmental considerations for a variety of biomass systems in different locations. Utility companies would benefit from the cofiring of biomass fuel since it would reduce the amount of sulfur dioxide emitted from their boilers (Demirbas, Ayhan. 2003). Also the use of biomass fuels may reduce the amount of nitrogen oxides emitted, and as well minimize increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

The Biomass Crop Assistance Program (BCAP) provides financial assistance to owners and operators of agricultural and non-industrial private forest land who wish to establish, produce, and deliver biomass feedstocks. BCAP provides two categories of assistance (USDA Farm Service Agency):

- Matching payments may be available for the delivery of eligible material to qualified biomass conversion facilities by eligible material owners. Qualified biomass conversion facilities produce heat, power, biobased products, or advanced biofuels from biomass feedstocks.
- Establishment and annual payments may be available to certain producers who enter into contracts with the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) to produce eligible biomass crops on contract acres within BCAP project areas.

Background

To date, there are a few regions that are looking into using woody biomass to produce electricity in the Northern US States (Nienow, S., K. T., McNamara, A. R Gillespie,. and P. V Preckel. 1999; Keoleian, and Volk, 2005; Jianbang and Smith, 2006). Creation of woody biomass markets in Michigan and Minnesota are being pursued by departments of natural resources as wildlife habitat-friendly and sustainable renewable energy source, and also as a way to reduce carbon footprints. Also use of woody biomass in the western US is being pursued to find a linkage between ecosystem restoration/fuel reductions where removal of fuels from the site are critical for reducing and controlling fire risk. There has also been some research done to look into the issues of using woody biomass as a second generation cellulosic ethanol feedstock; however, the technology needed to convert cellulosic biomass into ethanol is not economically viable to date (Hamelinck C. N., G. van Hooijdonk, A. PC Faaij. 2005, Guo Z., C. Sun, D. L. Grebner. 2007).

Woody biomass, in the Southern Illinois region, represents a potentially important sustainable resource as well. There is predominately an oak-hickory forest population in the lower half of the Midwestern landscape. Much of this area has been unsuitable for agriculture and has remained predominantly an oak-hickory population. The oak-hickory forest type has been in steady decline as young trees needed to replace presently dominant individuals have been largely displaced by non-oak and hickory species (Ruffiner and Groninger 2006). It is appropriate to conduct a pilot program in Southern Illinois as this portion of the Midwest is farthest advanced in transitioning toward maple dominance of oak forests. Programs to prevent and reverse the transition to beech maple are underway. These programs usually involve felling of non-oak stems to restart forest regeneration as well as intermittent prescribed burning; however, this work is limited due to its high costs, especially the costs associated with burning treatments (Ruffiner and Groninger 2006).

Restoration activities would benefit if improvement was made to felled material markets. Presently, felled material left on site show no measurable restoration benefits. In addition to promoting oak regeneration, these treatments will increase growth rate and value of future crop trees (Parker and Merritt 1995) where favorable markets are already well-established, increasing value to the landowner and regional value-added.

SUPPORTING LITERATURE

At the beginning of the 20th century, the United States switched from using biomass as a source for energy to fossil fuels. This switch was primarily

prompted by how cheap and available fossil fuels were at the time. As fossil fuel prices started to increase, there was also an increase in research and development and use for biomass as an energy resource. There are numerous crops that have potential to be energy crops through commercial energy farming (McKendry, 2002).

Biomass can be converted into three main types of products: electrical/heat energy, transportation fuel, and chemical feedstock. Some current technologies that are used to convert biomass are: thermal conversion, biomass power for generating electricity by direct combustion or gasification and pyrolysis, cofiring with coal, biological conversion of biomass and waste, biomass densification, domestic cook stoves and heating appliances, and solar photovoltaic and biomass based rural electrification (Demirbas, 2003).

From 1949 to 1990, the United States energy increased by 167%, and wood energy makes up a total of 82% for biomass use. In 1990, 3.3% exajoules of energy were produced from biomass, and by 1992, biofuels fired by biomass represented 6500 megawatts of electricity generation capacity in the United States (Hehenstein, and Wright, 1994).

A concern with utilizing woody biomass in the Southwest for energy production is that overharvesting will occur and land would be converted over into agricultural production; therefore, increasing herbicide usage. Increased herbicide usage and overuse can lead to contamination of wildlife (plants, soil organisms, above-ground insects/arthropods, mammals, birds) living in terrestrial

habitats. Wildlife within fields is most likely to be exposed to herbicides, particularly when fields are planted with crops (Freemark, K., C. Boutin).

Threats from high emission levels from greenhouse gasses which lead to climate change, has lead to increasing use of biomass for energy production. One giant positive to utilizing woody biomass for energy production is the amount of carbon dioxide produced from cofiring woody biomass is equal to the amount of carbon dioxide a woody biomass takes in during its life cycle. Thus, cofiring biomass with coal simultaneously provides among the most effective means of reducing new CO₂ emissions from coal-based power plants and among the most efficient and inexpensive uses of biomass (Baxter, 2005).

As an all organic material from plants, biomass is can be produced by converting sunlight into plant material from photosynthesis. Conversion of biomass can be achieved by applications of numerous technologies, however, each of these techniques have their own specific set of requirements. Technological developments relating to the conversion, production, etc. promise the application of biomass at lower cost and with higher conversion efficiency than was possible before, and more advanced options to produce electricity are looking promising and allow a cost effective use of energy crops such as production of methanol and hydrogen by means of gasification (McKendry, 2002).

Since woody biomass has a lower moisture, ash, and nitrogen content, and higher energy values the potential for woody biomass can be found where

biomass is converted into thermal energy and gasification more efficiently than herbaceous energy crops.

Advantages of utilizing woody biomass for energy production are:

- Good conversion characteristics
- Moderate storage/harvest losses
- On stump storage
- Preexisting markets for wood
- Good harvest yields
- Low energy input to produce
- Low cost
- Composition with low contaminants
- Low nutrient requirements

Disadvantages would be:

- 5 – 10 year payback periods from planting to harvest
- Management practices and equipment used would differ from that of row crop agriculture
- Fuel preparation, storage, and delivery
- Ash deposition and fly ash utilization
- Fuel conversion
- Pollutant formation
- Corrosion

Over the past 15 years, the Department of Energy (DOE), through the Biofuels Feedstock Development Program, has funded research directed

towards creating a short rotation woody crop (SRWC) supply systems for many regions of the United States (Tuskan, 1998). The regions that the DOE have been primarily looking into are the north-central and southeastern United States, with alternatives within the Pacific Northwest and northeastern United States. Proposed harvest of SRWC would happen during a 6 to 10 year rotation. The proposed rotation would provide control for wind erosion year round, wildfire cover during the winter and spring when annual crops are not present, and during the fall, when crops are being harvested, SRWC would provide a natural habitat for wildlife.

Economically speaking, in order for cofiring biomass with coal to be cost effective, the location of where the biomass comes from needs to be within a reasonable distance to the plant where it is to be converted. The size of a plant also plays an important role in how much biomass is needed. For example, a larger production plant would need more biomass delivered to them than a smaller plant, therefore, the larger plant would be able to purchase and transfer in biomass that was located farther away. Meaning the more biomass you need, the lower the cost is per load of biomass. In a study that focused on the costs analysis of utilizing woody biomass, researchers found that transportation distance plays a very important role in the feasibility of utilizing woody biomass as an energy source (S. Gautam, R. Pulkki, C. Shahi, and M. Leitch, 2010). However, the capital costs for cofiring biomass are less than those associated with the stand-alone biomass projects such as wind turbines, or any other renewable projects, and since they capitalize upon existing generating stations

and can be operated – or not – at the plant's discretion, cofiring projects are the lowest risk renewable energy projects, but at the same time, cofiring projects do not increase system capacity (E. Hughes, 2000).

When looking into starting a project, concerns of the public must be taken into account. In a previous study conducted in Oregon, researchers looked into the perspectives of stakeholders about converting woody biomass into energy. Their hope was to show that utilizing woody biomass as an energy source would help solve problems related to forest management. They found that most stakeholders were focused on were renewable energy, forest restoration, and rural development. Researchers saw that more than one biomass utilization opportunity excited the survey participants. However, the participants saw forest restoration as a key dominating factor for issues instead of using the biomass as source of bioenergy. More or less they found that stakeholders saw that energy remained a by-product of forest restoration, rather than energy demands directing forest management (M. Stidham and V. Simon-Brown, 2010).

Other concerns of the participants in this study, when it came to perspectives of the general public, it was found that there were numerous issues that the general public may be concerned about. Concerns such as biomass supply, when the biomass has to meet certain requirements, and lack of trust between involved parties, where members feared that a project might be stopped last minute and funding and time would be wasted, topped participants' concerns. To face these concerns, the researchers looked into social acceptability terms. Researchers saw the potential for collaboration, but

understood the concern of trying to get all groups participating to agree on a decision. Thus some stakeholders were interested in pilot programs where only a small area was affected during the process of utilizing woody biomass as a source of energy. Also researchers noted that the costs associated with harvest and transportation of the felled materials was a concern of the participants. In their findings they note that forest restoration was more important to involved participants than utilizing woody biomass for energy generation.

Specific Objectives of the Research

The main objective of this project is to find out whether or not the Southern Illinois landscape can be used as a sustainable source of energy for Southern Illinois. We will be focusing on the use of woody biomass for cofiring in energy production in this research. We also will be looking into the cost associated with harvesting feedstocks available prior to burns and also the benefits associated with the removal and how the removal of the woody biomass provides opportunities for growth in local economies. Some benefits to the removal would be the restoration of native ecosystems, such as the quality of game habitats for deer and turkeys, water quality maintenance, floral biodiversity, and neotropical bird diversity (Ruffner and Groninger 2006, Rogers et al. 2008).

Since the Southern Illinois climate change mitigation is the main factor in the ecosystem service for US biofuel policies, our focus will be primarily associated on how carbon markets and prices affect the removal for woody biomass.

Process

Since there is very little previous research work done looking at cofiring woody biomass with coal in energy production in Southern Illinois, I am having to analyze relatively new data and placing it into the frame work built for another cellulosic ethanol model.

Another limitation is that we had hoped to use individual county data to analyze the species of trees privately owned, and after collecting this data, it was decided that we would need to look at a larger area combination. Thus instead of individual counties alone, we are looking at two separate regions, the Illinois Claypan Region and the Southern Illinois Region. I have collected the data for each region separately and also combined both regions together. The purpose of looking at the regions individually and then collectively was to see if there was enough data available in each region to draw our results and conclusions (i.e., power in numbers).

Data

Since we know that it is not cost efficient to use woody biomass alone for the production of cellulosic ethanol alone, we are looking to see if it is feasible to cofire woody biomass with coal to produce energy. One of the first steps is defining our region and the types of forest and woody biomass, as well the ownership types for the forests. The first results that were pulled from the Forest Inventory Data Online (FIDO) were pulled from only eleven counties in the

extreme southern tip of Illinois, Alexander, Gallatin, Hardin, Jackson, Johnson, Massac, Pope, Pulaski, Saline, Union, and Williamson. It was decided after looking into each county individually that the data was inconclusive.

After looking at the results again, it was decided to look into the entire the Southern Illinois Region, as defined by FIDO, which consists of 16 counties, Alexander, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Johnson, Massac, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Saline, Union, White, and Williamson. It was also determined that we would need to consider a larger area than just the Southern Illinois Region, so we also looked up data for the Illinois Claypan Region (also defined by FIDO). The Illinois Claypan Region consists of 26 counties, Bond, Calhoun, Clark, Clay, Clinton, Crawford, Cumberland, Edwards, Effingham, Fayette, Greene, Jasper, Jefferson, Jersey, Lawrence, Macoupin, Madison, Marion, Monroe, Montgomery, Richland, St. Clair, Shelby, Wabash, Washington, and Wayne. Another decision was to look into three primary forest type groups, oak/hickory, elm/ash/cottonwood, and maple/beech/birch.

Data was pulled for both regions separately and the Southern and Claypan regions were pulled together to see what the combined data would show. The data is spread out over a five year time frame and shows the acres of each forest-type group and also ownership for the acres by the forest-type group. Within the Southern Illinois region we find that 77% of the forest-type group is oak/hickory, 15% is elm/ash/cottonwood, and only 2% is maple/beech/birch. In the Illinois Claypan, 77% is oak/hickory, 21% is elm/ash/cottonwood, and 1% is maple/beech/birch. With the Southern Illinois and Illinois Claypan region

combined, oak/hickory contributes to 77% of the total forest-type, elm/ash/cottonwood contributes 18%, and maple/beech/birch has a 2% contribution rate.

As far as for the ownership of the forest groups, we are primarily interested in the land that is privately owned. In the Southern Illinois Region 68.3% of the three forest-types acres we are interested in are privately owned with the remaining acres being owned by the forest service, federal, state, and local governments. In the Illinois Claypan, 92.3% is privately owned. So overall all, 81.2% of the total forest-type acres for the Southern Illinois and Illinois Claypan region is privately owned. By avoiding utilization of biomass from national and state forests and parks, and only focusing on private land ownership, we can more effectively manage the removal of biomass and types new growth, thus establishing a woody biomass crop that would be most effective for cleaner and higher combustion rates and more aesthetically pleasing to the land owner and public.

Carbon Online Estimator

Much like the Forest Inventory Data Online, we are using the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service's and National Council for Air and Stream Improvements Inc.'s Carbon Online Estimator (COLE) to help aid us with making our decisions based on cofiring woody biomass with coal in the production of energy. The primary purpose of the COLE Report is to allow users to view the specs of the above ground distribution of carbon. COLE also allows

users to examine the characteristics of carbon for the entire United States or by a specific state, region, or county.

With the COLE Database, we were able to breakdown our areas of study to include only the regions that were examined in the Forest Inventory Data Online (FIDO) Database. The three regions consisted of a total of 42 Illinois counties. The Southern Illinois Region consisted of 16 counties: Alexander, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jackson, Johnson, Massac, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Randolph, Saline, Union, White, and Williamson counties. The Illinois Claypan Region included 26 counties: Bond, Calhoun, Clark, Clay, Clinton, Crawford, Cumberland, Edwards, Effingham, Fayette, Greene, Jasper, Jefferson, Jersey, Lawrence, Macoupin, Madison, Marion, Monroe, Montgomery, Richland, St. Clair, Shelby, Wabash, Washington, and Wayne counties. We also looked at Southern Illinois and Illinois Claypan as a region combined together.

Not only did we modify the reports to include only the counties that were wanted, we also selected two filter options. Since we are interested in reproducing certain wood types, we selected three carbon stocks in the forest type group filter: Oak/Hickory, Elm/Ash/Cottonwood, and Maple/Beech/Birch. In the ownership group filter, we selected Private since we are looking in to land that is not publicly or state owned.

Carbon Monitoring for Action

Another data base used to find the amount of electricity produced from fossil fuels was Carbon Monitoring for Action (CARMA). Carbon Monitoring for Action (CARMA) is a massive database containing information on the carbon

emissions of over 50,000 power plants and 4,000 power companies worldwide. Power generation accounts for 40% of all carbon emissions in the United States and about one-quarter of global emissions. CARMA is the first global inventory of a major, emissions-producing sector of the economy (CARMA, 2011).

The data was pulled for the Illinois counties involved with the project. The report pulled 22 counties from Illinois with power plants. The power plants were Clay, Clinton, Crawford, Cumberland, Effingham, Fayette, Franklin, Hamilton, Jackson, Jasper, Madison, Marion, Massac, Monroe, Montgomery, Perry, Randolph, Saint Clair, Washington, Wayne, White, and Williamson. Of these counties, only five already use fossil fuels for energy production, Crawford, Effingham, Jackson, Madison, and Saint Clair.

From these counties, CARMA reported just how much energy was produced, the amount of carbon released from fossil fuel combustion, intensity (which is the MWh produced per pound), and the total carbon produced from these plants. From these results, the intensity was combined with the total carbon output from fossil fuels, and also percentages for the amount of carbon produced from fossil fuels we would like to see replaced with carbon output produced from woody biomass.

Data Progress/ Errors

After careful analysis of the first set of data retrieved, it was decided that we would remove the data for the Elm/Ash/Cottonwood Group and continue on with just Oak/Hickory and Maple/Beech/Birch. Upon retrieval of the new data for just private land owners in the Southern Illinois Region as well as the Illinois

Claypan Region, it was evident that we still did not have enough data for the Southern Illinois Claypan Region for Maple/Beech/Birch and for the Illinois Claypan for Maple/Beech/Birch. After careful consideration we decided to add the Illinois Prairie Region to the Central Illinois Region for Maple/Beech/Birch, and we have not decided what to do with the Southern Illinois Region. The following data is the new data that depicts the scenario if we continue without the Southern Illinois Maple/Beech/Birch.

The following tables show the MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon production available from Woody Biomass, and also the MWh/Ton of Carbon produced from fossil fuels. The percentages listed within the table are a portion of the total carbon emitted from firing fossil fuels, such as coal, natural gas, and oil, for energy production. To obtain the final information, data obtained were merged together and conversions of usage and production, and availability were processed.

The MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon production available from woody biomass table is the product of merging the FIDO and COLE databases. The charts (appendix) depict the cross sectional data from the FIDO Database into the COLE Database for both the Southern Illinois Region, the Illinois Claypan Region, and the combination of the Southern Illinois Region and Illinois Claypan Region. Once merged, the following steps were processed. The Tonnes/Hectare were converted into Short US Tons/Hectare (1.1023), and then Converted into Short US Tons/Acre (2.471). Then to obtain the energy levels, we know that wood at 20% moisture, when fired, is equivalent to 15 Gigajoules/Short US Ton.

Thus we took the Short US Tons/Acre and converted them into GJ/Short US Ton/Acre. The final step was to take last results and convert the data into MWh/Short US Ton/Acre (0.278).

The MWh/Ton of Carbon produced from Fossil Fuels was achieved by taking the CARMA data obtained for Illinois power plants that currently use fossil fuels for energy production. Since we are not interested in going to a complete switch over from fossil fuels to woody biomass, it was decided find different levels of carbon emitted from the combustion of fossil fuels for energy production. It was decided that 10%, 15%, 20%, and 30% fossil fuel carbon production would be enough to proceed with the research (Carbon Monitoring for Action, 2011). In a USDA Forest Service Marketing Research project, it was found that efficient levers of cofiring could be reached at 10% to 15%, and could be efficient to as much as a 40% cofiring mixture (Bergman and Zerbe, 2004). To obtain the amounts of the percentage of carbon produced from fossil fuel combustion, the Intensity level was combined with the percentages of fossil fuel carbon emitted, which resulted in MWh/pound of carbon emitted from fossil fuels, thus the results were converted into MWh/US Short Ton (2000).

The results from the two tables (Table 1 and Table 2) show the current amount of carbon available from woody biomass combustion (solely from private land ownership) and also the percentage amount of carbon that is current being produced from fossil fuels that we would like to see replaced by woody biomass combustion. From the results, it is reasonable to say that there is enough woody biomass available in Illinois from private land owners to consider this project as

feasible. And since the woody biomass removed would be replaced on a continuous removal and planting cycle, it would also seem to be feasible for this project to be considered for long term energy production.

MWh/Ton of Carbon produced from Fossil Fuels				
County	10%	15%	20%	30%
Clay	0	0	0	0
Clinton	0	0	0	0
Crawford	0.119172	0.178757	0.238343	0.357515
Cumberland	0	0	0	0
Effingham	0.025651	0.038476	0.051301	0.076952
Fayette	0	0	0	0
Franklin	0	0	0	0
Hamilton	0	0	0	0
Jackson	0.041879	0.062818	0.083758	0.125637
Jasper	0	0	0	0
Madison	0.092389	0.138584	0.184779	0.277168
Marion	0	0	0	0
Massac	0	0	0	0
Monroe	0	0	0	0
Montgomery	0	0	0	0
Perry	0	0	0	0
Randolph	0	0	0	0
Saint Clair	0.002462	0.003693	0.004924	0.007386
Washington	0	0	0	0
Wayne	0	0	0	0
White	0	0	0	0
Williamson	0	0	0	0
	0.281553	0.422329	0.563105	0.844658

Table 1.

MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon production available from Woody Biomass		
Southern Illinois Region		
	Total	
Oak/Hickory	5252.905	MWh/ton/acre
Maple/Beech/Birch	0.000	MWh/ton/acre
Total	5252.905	
Illinois Claypan Region		
	Total	
Oak/Hickory	6766.840	MWh/ton/acre
Maple/Beech/Birch	10784.347	MWh/ton/acre
Total	17551.187	
Southern Illinois and Illinois Claypan Region		
	Total	
Oak/Hickory	6686.646	MWh/ton/acre
Maple/Beech/Birch	13836.869	MWh/ton/acre
Total	20523.515	

Table 2.

Cost Analysis

Another key factor for utilizing woody biomass for energy production is the costs associated with removal, transportation, location, and the replanting of woody biomass. Since there are only five counties that currently utilize fossil fuels for energy production, the costs associated with transportation to and from the woody biomass removal site would greatly impact the feasibility of the project. Since there is already equipment available for woody biomass, the removal would not be a problem.

Transportation of the biomass is more likely the concern. Since the biomass is removed in stalks, it must be broken down in to wood chips or pellets before it can be delivered to an electricity plant. The double delivery would cause a greater cost, but one way the cost could be cut is if the equipment for chipping the stalks was located at the removal site. However, if the plants wanted pellets for cofiring, they would have to haul the wood to a facility where the chips could be compressed or more equipment can be delivered to the removal site for production. Also wood pellets have been found to have a higher Btu combustion rate (R. Bain and R. Overend, 2002). Compressed pellets would provide a more consistent burn releasing a steady stream of energy output, whereas wood chips burn at an uneven rate causing shorter higher burst of energy output.

Location of the plant that the woody biomass would be delivered to play a major role not only for the cost of delivery, but for the amount that would need to be delivered to be profitable. The closer the plant is to where the woody biomass was taken down, the smaller the delivery cost. So the further away the plant is from the removal site, the amount that would need to be delivered would have to be greater to break even on delivery costs.

Studies have shown that the costs associated to cofire woody biomass with coal have been relatively uniform in many regions. In a Canadian Study, costs to remove, transport, and cofire woody biomass (for 1000 dry tons) was expected to reach nearly \$47.16/MWh (Kumar, 2003). A study in West Virginia expected costs to range from \$37 - \$46/ dry ton/ MWh just for extraction costs, just a bit higher than the Department of Energy's target cost of \$35/dry ton/ MWh,

and without including extraction costs, they could see the cost being reduced to \$27.78/dry ton/MWh (McNeel, Wang, Wu, Goff, 2008),. Another study reported the cost would near \$53/MWh (Gan, Smith, 2006), which is not too far from another study that determined that at cofiring coal with woody biomass at a 15% level would result in an average cost of \$50.37/MWh (English, et al.. 2007).

Conclusion

The costs associated with cofiring will be the primary concern of harvesting trees and transporting them to energy facilities, as well as convincing private land owners that this would be a great opportunity not only for their region, but for the environment. Fortunately there is a substantial supply of woody biomass in Illinois for landowners and power plants to consider cofiring coal with woody biomass for energy production. Cofiring would not only help increase the esthetics of the region and reducing the carbon footprint we leave behind, but it can also prove to be another source of income for the private land owners that would chose to lease their land for such a project.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bain, Richard L and Ralph P. Overend. 2002. Biomass for Heat and Power. February 2002.
- Baxter, Larry. 2005. Biomass-coal co-combustion: opportunity for affordable renewable energy. *Fuel* 84, pp.1295-1302.
- Bergman, Richard, John Zerbe. Primer on Wood Biomass for Energy. USDA Forest Service, State and Private Forestry Technology Marketing Unit Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wisconsin. 26 May 2004.
- Carbon Monitoring for Action, 2011. www.carma.org.
- Demirbas, Ayhan. 2003. Sustainable cofiring of biomass with coal. *Energy Conservation Management* 44, pp. 1465-1479.
- English, Burton C., Kim Jensen, Jamey Menard, Marie E. Walsh, Craig Brandt, Jim Van Dyke, and Stanton. 2007. Economic Impacts of Carbon Taxes and Biomass Feedstock Usage in Southeastern United States Coal Utilities. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 103-119.
- Fralish, J. S., F. B. Crooks, J. L. Chambers, and F. M. Harty. 1991. Comparison of presettlement, second-growth and old-growth forest on six site types in the Illinois Shawnee Hills. *American Midland Naturalist*. 125, pp. 294-309.
- Freemark, Kathryn, Celine Boutin. 1995. Impacts of agricultural herbicide use on terrestrial wildlife in temperate landscapes: A review with special reference to North America. *Agriculture, Ecosystems, and Environment*, Vol. 52, No. 2-3, pp. 67-99.
- Frey, Gregory E., D. Evan Mercer, Frederick W. Cubbage, and Robert C. Abt. Economic Potential of Agroforestry and Forestry in the Lower Mississippi Alluvial Valley with Incentive Programs and Carbon Payments. *South. J. Appl. For.* 34(4) 2010.
- Gautam, Shuva, Reino Pulkki, Chander Shahi, and Mathew Leitch. 2010. Economic and energy efficiency of salvaging biomass from wildfire burn areas for bioenergy production in northwestern Ontario: A case study. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, Vol. 34, No. 11, pp. 1562-1572.
- Guo Z., C. Sun, D. L. Grebner. 2007. Utilization of forest derived biomass for energy production in the U.S.A.: status, challenges, and public policies. *International Forestry Review* 9(3): 748-758
- Hamelinck C. N., G. van Hooijdonk, A. PC Faaij. 2005. Ethanol from lignocellulosic biomass: techno-economic performance in short-, middle- and long-term. *Biomass and Bioenergy*. Vol. 28, No. 4, pp. 384-410.

- Haq, Zia. 2002. Biomass for Electricity Generation. U.S. Energy Information System. <http://www.eia.gov/oiaf/analysispaper/biomass/index.html>.
- Hohenstein, William G., and Lynn L. Wright. 1994. Biomass Energy Production in the United States: An Overview. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 161-173.
- Hughes, Evan. 2000. Biomass cofiring: economics, policy and opportunities. *Biomass and Bioenergy*. Vol. 19, pp.457-465.
- Jianbang G. and C.T. Smith. 2006. A comparative analysis of woody biomass and coal for electricity generation under various CO₂ emission reductions and taxes. *Biomass and Bioenergy*. Vol. 30, No. 4.
- Keoleian, G. A. and T. A. Volk. 2005. Renewable Energy from Willow Biomass Crops: Life Cycle Energy, Environmental and Economic Performance. *Critical Reviews in Plant Sciences*, Vol. 24, No. 5.
- Kumar, Amit, Jay B. Cameron, Peter C. Flynn. 2003. Biomass Power Cost and Optimum Plant Size in Western Canada. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, Vol. 24, No. 6, pp. 445-464.
- McKendry, Peter. 2002. Energy Production from Biomass (part 1): Overview of Biomass. *Bioresource Technology*, Vol. 83, pp. 37-46.
- McNeel, Joseph, Jingxin Wang, Jinzhuo Wu, Tony Goff. 2008. Woody Biomass Sustainability for Bioenergy Production in West Virginia. Division of Forestry and Natural Resources, West Virginia University.
<http://www.ncfap.org/documents/BEADII/WVUBiomassGChallengeBEADII.pdf>
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2007. Units & Conversions Fact Sheet. http://www.mitenergyclub.org/assets/2008/11/15/Units_ConvFactors.MIT_EnergyClub_Factsheet.v8.pdf.
- Nienow, S., K. T., McNamara, A. R Gillespie, and P. V Preckel. 1999. Model for the Economic Evaluation of Plantation Biomass Production for Cofiring with Coal in Electricity Production. *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*. Vol. 28, No. 1.
- Parker, G.R. and C. Merritt. 1995. The Central Region. Chapter 4 in J.W. Barrett *Regional Silviculture of the United States* Wiley, New York.
- Ruffner, C. M. and J. W. Groninger. 2006. Making the case for fire in southern Illinois Forests. *Journal of Forestry*. 104, pp.78-83.

Stidham, Melanie, and Viviane Simon-Brown. 2010. Stakeholders perspectives on converting forest biomass into energy in Oregon, USA. Biomass and Bioenergy (2010), doi:10.1016/j.biombioe.2010.08.014.

Tuskan, G.A.. 1998. Short-Rotation Woody Crop Supply Systems in the United States: What do we know and what do we need to know? Biomass and Bioenergy, Vol. 12, No.4, pp. 307-315.

USDA Farm Service Agency. Energy Programs, Biomass Crop Assistance Program.
<http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/webapp?area=home&subject=ener&topic=bca>
p

USDA Forest Service. Forest Inventory and Analysis Program, National Woodland Owner Survey. <http://fiatools.fs.fed.us/NWOS/tablemaker.jsp>.

USDA Forest Service. Forest Inventory Data Online.
<http://fiatools.fs.fed.us/fido/index.html>.

U.S. Energy Information System. State Energy Data System. Table ET1. Primary Energy, Electricity, and Total Energy Price and Expenditure Estimates, Selected Years, 1970-2009, Illinois.
http://www.eia.gov/state/seds/sep_prices/total/pdf/pr_IL.pdf

APENDIX

COUNTIES IN SOUTHERN ILLINOIS REGION
ALEXANDER
FRANKLIN
GALLATIN
HAMILTON
HARDIN
JACKSON
JOHNSON
MASSAC
PERRY
POPE
PULASKI
RANDOLPH
SALINE
UNION
WHITE
WILLIAMSON

Table 3:

COUNTIES IN ILLINOIS CLAYPAN
BOND
CALHOUN
CLARK
CLAY
CLINTON
CRAWFORD
CUMBERLAND
EDWARDS
EFFINGHAM
FAYETTE
GREENE
JASPER
JEFFERSON
JERSEY
LAWRENCE
MACOUPIN
MADISON
MARION
MONROE
MONTGOMERY
RICHLAND
ST CLAIR
SHELBY
WABASH
WASHINGTON
WAYNE

Table 4:

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume								
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Site productivity (in acres)								
Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class						Total	% of Total
	225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)	--	24,054	105,034	343,246	371,512	107,205	951,051	0.77
Elm / ash / cottonwood (700)	--	--	21,111	80,460	57,886	20,543	180,002	0.15
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,849	--	22,624	0.02
Totals:	1,949	26,003	147,806	473,186	458,846	131,875	1,239,665	0.93
% of Total	0.002	0.021	0.119	0.382	0.370	0.106		
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse); if estimate black , pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate green , pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate red , pse is greater than 50%)								

Table 5: Southern Illinois Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume							
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Ownership group (in acres)							
Forest-type group	Ownership group				Total	% of Total	
	Forest Service (10)	Other Federal (20)	State and Local Gov't (30)	Private (40)			
Oak / hickory (500)	237,323	26,667	51,327	635,733	951,051	0.77	
Elm / ash / cottonwood (700)	1,099	1,987	24,366	152,549	180,002	0.15	
Maple / beech / birch (800)	5,732	--	--	16,892	22,624	0.02	
Totals:	288,226	28,655	75,694	847,091	1,239,665	0.93	
% of Total	0.233	0.023	0.061	0.683			
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse); if estimate black , pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate green , pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate red , pse is greater than 50%)							

Table 6: Southern Illinois Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume							
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Site productivity (in acres)							
Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class					Total	% of Total
	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)	15,690	59,046	380,144	535,035	122,883	1,112,803	0.77
Elm / ash / cottonwood (700)	1,931	12,464	112,443	148,125	21,650	296,613	0.21
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	7,958	10,244	--	18,202	0.01
Totals:	17,621	71,510	507,723	698,259	144,538	1,439,651	0.99
% of Totals	0.012	0.050	0.353	0.485	0.100		
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse); if estimate is black, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate is green, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate is red, pse is greater than 50%)							

Table 7: Illinois Claypan Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume						
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Ownership group (in acres)						
Forest-type group	Ownership group			Total	% of Total	
	Other Federal (20)	State and Local Gov't (30)	Private (40)			
Oak / hickory (500)	15,672	48,284	1,048,847	1,112,803	0.77	
Elm / ash / cottonwood (700)	13,150	34,272	249,191	296,613	0.21	
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	18,202	18,202	0.01	
Totals:	28,822	82,556	1,328,274	1,439,651	0.99	
% of Total	0.020	0.057	0.923			
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse); if estimate is black, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate is green, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate is red, pse is greater than 50%)						

Table 8: Illinois Claypan Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume								
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Site productivity (in acres)								
Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class						Total	% of Total
	225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)	--	39,744	164,080	723,390	906,547	230,093	2,063,854	0.77
Elm / ash / cottonwood (700)	--	1,931	33,575	192,903	206,012	42,193	476,614	0.18
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	17,734	23,092	--	40,826	0.02
Totals:	1,949	43,624	219,317	980,909	1,157,105	276,413	2,679,317	0.96
% of Total	0.001	0.016	0.082	0.366	0.432	0.103		
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse); if estimate is black, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate is green, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate is red, pse is greater than 50%)								

Table 9: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume							
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Ownership group (in acres)							
Forest-type group	Ownership group				Total	% of Total	
	Forest Service (10)	Other Federal (20)	State and Local Gov't (30)	Private (40)			
Oak / hickory (500)	237,323	42,339	99,612	1,684,579	2,063,854	0.77	
Elm / ash / cottonwood (700)	1,099	15,137	58,638	401,740	476,614	0.18	
Maple / beech / birch (800)	5,732	--	--	35,094	40,826	0.02	
Totals:	288,226	57,476	158,250	2,175,365	2,679,317	0.96	
% of Total	0.108	0.021	0.059	0.812			
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse); if estimate is black, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate is green, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate is red, pse is greater than 50%)							

Table 10: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume									
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Site productivity (in acres)									
Site Productivity Class									
Forest-type group	225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	60-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)	Total	% of Total	
Oak / hickory (500)	--	24,054	105,031	343,246	371,512	107,205	951,051	0.77	
Mean Volume				107.51	70.94	19.37			
Live Tree				59.19	36.6	9.50			
Dead Tree				2.77	2.30	0.80			
Under Story				2.32	2.80	3.46			
Down Dead Wood				5.45	4.6	9.30			
Forest Floor				7.88	4.42	10.99			
Soil				45.95	45.95	45.95			
Total Non Soil				77.56	50.73	34.06			
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,849	--	22,624	0.02	
Mean Volume			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Live Tree			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Dead Tree			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Under Story			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Down Dead Wood			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Forest Floor			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Soil			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Total Non Soil			#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!			
Totals:	1,949	26,003	147,806	473,186	458,846	131,875	1,239,665	0.79	
% of Total	0.002	0.021	0.119	0.382	0.370	0.106			

(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse): if estimate **black**, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate **green**, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate **red**, pse is greater than 50%)

Table 11: Southern Illinois Region

Inventory -- Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume									
Illinois (17) -- Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Site productivity (in acres)									
Site Productivity Class									
Forest-type group	225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	60-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)	Total	% of Total	
Oak / hickory (500)	--	24,054	105,031	343,246	371,512	107,205	951,051	0.77	
Mean Volume			132.14	100.22	66.70	16.00			
Live Tree			73.93	57.80	39.52	9.83			
Dead Tree			3.70	2.27	1.20	0.26			
Under Story			2.34	2.52	2.82	3.01			
Down Dead Wood			6.70	5.63	4.75	7.8			
Forest Floor			9.13	5.93	4.75	5.37			
Soil			45.95	45.95	45.95	45.95			
Total Non Soil			9.13	74.15	53.12	26.28			
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,849	--	22,624	0.02	
Mean Volume			134.43	96.70	67.56	16.42			
Live Tree			72.25	51.86	36.17	8.77			
Dead Tree			9.72	9.72	9.72	9.72			
Under Story			2.26	2.39	2.52	2.20			
Down Dead Wood			5.10	5.19	5.10	5.10			
Forest Floor			26.77	26.77	26.77	26.77			
Soil			64.86	64.86	64.86	64.86			
Total Non Soil			116.20	95.93	80.37	52.65			
Totals:	1,949	26,003	147,806	473,186	458,846	131,875	1,239,665	0.79	
% of Total	0.002	0.021	0.119	0.382	0.370	0.106			

(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse): if estimate **black**, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate **green**, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate **red**, pse is greater than 50%)

Table 12: Illinois Claypan Region

Inventory – Illinois 2003-2007: area/volume								
Illinois (17) – Area of sampled forest land by Forest type group and Site productivity (in acres)								
Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class						Total	% of Total
	225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)	--	24,054	105,033	343,246	371,512	107,203	951,051	0.77
Mean Volume			126.90	99.49	68.22	17.02		
Live Tree			71.08	55.92	38.48	9.64		
Dead Tree			3.38	2.5	1.65	0.39		
Under Story			2.32	2.5	2.82	3.09		
Down Dead Wood			6.49	5.44	4.67	8.30		
Forest Floor			9.12	5.90	4.70	5.78		
Soil			45.95	45.95	45.95	45.95		
Total Non Soil			9.12	72.28	52.30	27.20		
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,843	--	22,618	0.02
Mean Volume				131.11	96.92	53.9	11.84	
Live Tree				70.78	52.20	29.12	7.14	
Dead Tree				6.59	6.5	6.06	2.78	
Under Story				2.22	2.35	2.60	2.23	
Down Dead Wood				5.17	5.1	5.17	5.17	
Forest Floor				26.52	26.52	26.52	26.52	
Soil				64.86	64.86	64.86	64.86	
Total Non Soil				432.28	96.10	69.47	43.89	
Totals:	1,949	26,003	147,806	473,186	458,846	131,876	1,239,665	0.79
% of Total	0.002	0.021	0.119	0.382	0.370	0.106		
(The color of each estimated value represents percent sampling error (pse): if estimate is black, pse is less than or equal to 25%; if estimate is green, pse is greater than 25% and less than or equal to 50%; if estimate is red, pse is greater than 50%)								

Table 13: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region

	Site Productivity Class						Soil	Total Non Soil
	225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)		
AGE CLASS	MEAN VOLUME	LIVE TREE	DEAD TREE	UNDER STORY	DOWN DEAD WOOD	FOREST FLOOR		
YEARS	M3/HA	TONNES CARBON/HA						
0	0	0	0	0	17.57	27.34	45.95	44.91
5	2.87	1.31	0.17	5.33	11.07	12.44	45.95	30.32
10	14.33	6.78	0.71	4.88	7.43	6.58	45.95	26.38
15	31.05	15.13	1.31	3.85	5.6	4.52	45.95	30.43
20	48.61	24.3	1.82	3.26	4.82	4.05	45.95	38.24
25	64.41	32.91	2.18	2.91	4.59	4.21	45.95	46.79
30	77.47	40.31	2.42	2.69	4.63	4.63	45.95	54.67
35	87.73	46.35	2.57	2.54	4.78	5.13	45.95	61.38
40	95.53	51.11	2.67	2.45	4.96	5.65	45.95	66.84
50	105.57	57.56	2.77	2.33	5.29	6.65	45.95	74.61
60	110.88	61.18	2.81	2.28	5.52	7.75	45.95	79.36
70	113.61	63.16	2.82	2.25	5.66	8.4	45.95	82.3
80	115	64.23	2.82	2.23	5.74	9.16	45.95	84.19
90	115.7	64.8	2.83	2.22	5.79	9.85	45.95	85.49
100	116.06	65.11	2.83	2.22	5.82	10.48	45.95	86.45

Table 14: Southern Illinois Region Oak/Hickory Private Ownership Group

		225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)	
AGE CLASS	MEAN VOLUME	LIVE TREE	DEAD TREE	UNDER STORY	DOWN DEAD WOOD	FOREST FLOOR	SOIL	TOTAL NON SOIL
YEARS	M3/HA	TONNES CARBON/HA						
0								
5								
10								
15								
20								
25								
30								
35								
40								
50								
60								
70								
80								
90								
100								

Table 15: Southern Illinois Region Maple/Beech/Birch Private Ownership Group

		225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)		
AGE CLASS	MEAN VOLUME	LIVE TREE	DEAD TREE	UNDER STORY	DOWN DEAD WOOD	FOREST FLOOR	SOIL	TOTAL NON SOIL	
YEARS	M3/HA	TONNES CARBON/HA							
0	0	0	0	0	14.26	7.67	45.95	21.94	
5	2.01	1.28	0.03	4.03	9.06	5.72	45.95	20.13	
10	10.87	6.8	0.16	4.24	6.23	4.75	45.95	22.17	
15	25.31	15.55	0.4	3.6	4.94	4.37	45.95	28.86	
20	42.19	25.52	0.73	3.18	4.54	4.36	45.95	38.32	
25	59.03	35.21	1.1	2.91	4.61	4.57	45.95	48.39	
30	74.37	43.83	1.48	2.73	4.88	4.92	45.95	57.84	
35	87.59	51.09	1.85	2.61	5.22	5.33	45.95	66.1	
40	98.57	56.99	2.19	2.53	5.56	5.77	45.95	73.04	
50	114.51	65.33	2.78	2.43	6.11	6.69	45.95	83.32	
60	124.35	70.24	3.22	2.38	6.48	7.58	45.95	89.91	
70	130.22	73.08	3.54	2.35	6.71	8.42	45.95	94.1	
80	133.66	74.68	3.77	2.34	6.85	9.19	45.95	96.82	
90	135.65	75.58	3.92	2.33	6.92	9.9	45.95	98.65	
100	136.8	76.08	4.03	2.32	6.97	10.55	45.95	99.95	

Table 16: Illinois Claypan Region Oak/Hickory Private Ownership Group

		225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)	
AGE CLASS	MEAN VOLUME	LIVE TREE	DEAD TREE	UNDER STORY	DOWN DEAD WOOD	FOREST FLOOR	SOIL	TOTAL NON SOIL
YEARS	M3/HA	TONNES CARBON/HA						
0	0	0	9.72	0	5.19	26.77	64.86	41.68
5	0.29	0.16	9.72	0.64	5.19	26.77	64.86	42.48
10	1.97	1.05	9.72	2.21	5.19	26.77	64.86	44.93
15	5.57	2.97	9.72	2.87	5.19	26.77	64.86	47.52
20	11.14	5.94	9.72	2.98	5.19	26.77	64.86	50.6
25	18.42	9.82	9.72	2.92	5.19	26.77	64.86	54.42
30	27.03	14.43	9.72	2.83	5.19	26.77	64.86	58.94
35	36.6	19.55	9.72	2.73	5.19	26.77	64.86	63.97
40	46.74	24.99	9.72	2.65	5.19	26.77	64.86	69.32
50	67.56	36.17	9.72	2.52	5.19	26.77	64.86	80.37
60	87.6	46.95	9.72	2.42	5.19	26.77	64.86	91.06
70	105.8	56.77	9.72	2.35	5.19	26.77	64.86	100.8
80	121.69	65.35	9.72	2.3	5.19	26.77	64.86	109.34
90	135.18	72.66	9.72	2.26	5.19	26.77	64.86	116.6
100	146.41	78.75	9.72	2.23	5.19	26.77	64.86	122.67

Table 17: Illinois Claypan Region Maple/Beech Birch Private Ownership Group

		225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)	
AGE CLASS	MEAN VOLUME	LIVE TREE	DEAD TREE	UNDER STORY	DOWN DEAD WOOD	FOREST FLOOR	SOIL	TOTAL NON SOIL
YEARS	M3/HA	TONNES CARBON/HA						
0	0	0	0	0	15.49	8.92	45.95	24.41
5	2.23	1.27	0.05	4.25	9.74	6.28	45.95	21.59
10	11.8	6.7	0.26	4.37	6.59	4.95	45.95	22.87
15	26.94	15.26	0.61	3.66	5.11	4.42	45.95	29.05
20	44.14	24.96	1.02	3.19	4.58	4.34	45.95	38.1
25	60.82	34.33	1.45	2.91	4.56	4.53	45.95	47.77
30	75.62	42.62	1.85	2.72	4.77	4.87	45.95	56.82
35	88.05	49.56	2.18	2.6	5.07	5.29	45.95	64.69
40	98.13	55.18	2.47	2.51	5.37	5.74	45.95	71.26
50	112.29	63.03	2.89	2.41	5.87	6.68	45.95	80.88
60	120.67	67.66	3.16	2.35	6.21	7.57	45.95	86.96
70	125.47	70.3	3.33	2.32	6.42	8.41	45.95	90.78
80	128.17	71.78	3.43	2.31	6.54	9.18	45.95	93.23
90	129.68	72.6	3.48	2.3	6.61	9.89	45.95	94.88
100	130.52	73.05	3.52	2.3	6.65	10.54	45.95	96.06

Table 18: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region Oak/Hickory Private Ownership Group

		225+ cubic feet/acre/year (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/year (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/year (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/year (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/year (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/year (6)	
AGE CLASS	MEAN VOLUME	LIVE TREE	DEAD TREE	UNDER STORY	DOWN DEAD WOOD	FOREST FLOOR	SOIL	TOTAL NON SOIL
YEARS	M3/HA	TONNES CARBON/HA						
0	0	0	0	0	5.17	26.52	64.86	31.7
5	0.51	0.28	0.37	1.11	5.17	26.52	64.86	33.45
10	3.26	1.77	1.55	2.78	5.17	26.52	64.86	37.79
15	8.78	4.76	2.93	3.1	5.17	26.52	64.86	42.49
20	16.73	9.07	4.1	3.02	5.17	26.52	64.86	47.88
25	26.43	14.31	4.96	2.88	5.17	26.52	64.86	53.84
30	27.18	20.11	5.54	2.75	5.17	26.52	64.86	60.1
35	48.35	26.13	5.93	2.64	5.17	26.52	64.86	66.4
40	59.47	32.11	6.18	2.55	5.17	26.52	64.86	72.54
50	80.26	43.28	6.43	2.43	5.17	26.52	64.86	93.84
60	98.04	52.81	6.53	2.34	5.17	26.52	64.86	93.38
70	112.46	60.52	6.57	2.28	5.17	26.52	64.86	101.07
80	123.76	66.55	6.58	2.25	5.17	26.52	64.86	1070.08
90	132.42	71.16	6.59	2.22	5.17	26.52	64.86	111.66
100	138.94	74.62	6.59	2.2	5.17	26.52	64.86	115.11

Table 19: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region Maple/Beech/Birch Private Ownership Group

Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class						Total	% of Total
	225+ cubic feet/acre/y ear (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/y ear (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/y ear (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/y ear (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/y ear (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/y ear (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)		24,054	105,031	343,246	371,512	107,205	951,051	0.77
Mean Volume				1220.79	805.53	219.97	2246.29	
Live Tree				672.06	415.71	107.92	1195.71	
Dead Tree				31.40	26.12	9.11	66.62	
Under Story				26.25	31.79	39.33	97.42	
Down Dead Wood				61.83	52.35	105.58	219.75	
Forest Floor				89.52	50.19	124.75	264.46	
Soil				521.77	521.77	521.77	1565.30	
Total Non Soil				880.90	576.04	386.71	1843.65	
TOTAL (MWh)				3504.56	2479.50	1515.13	5252.90	MWh/ton/acre
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,849	--	22,624	0.02
Mean Volume			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Live Tree			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Dead Tree			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Under Story			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Down Dead Wood			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Forest Floor			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Soil			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total Non Soil			0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
TOTAL (MWh)							0.00	MWh/ton/acre

Table 20: Southern Illinois Region MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon Production Available

Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class						Total	% of Total
	225+ cubic feet/acre/y ear (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/y ear (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/y ear (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/y ear (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/y ear (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/y ear (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)	--	24,054	105,034	343,246	371,512	107,205	951,051	0.77
Mean Volume			1,500.42	1,138.04	757.36	182.54	3578.39	
Live Tree			839.50	656.36	448.75	111.62	2056.24	
Dead Tree			41.97	25.8	14.65	3.00	85.43	
Under Story			26.62	28.65	32.02	34.10	121.47	
Down Dead Wood			77.06	63.93	53.88	88.64	283.50	
Forest Floor			103.65	67.34	53.88	61.02	285.89	
Soil			521.77	521.77	521.77	521.77	2087.06	
Total Non Soil			103.65	842.02	603.13	298.46	1847.25	
TOTAL (MWh)			3214.62	3343.92	2485.46	1301.22	6766.84	MWh/ton/acre
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,849	--	22,624	0.02
Mean Volume			1,526.43	1,098.04	767.15	186.43	3578.04	
Live Tree			820.44	588.87	410.71	99.56	1919.59	
Dead Tree			110.37	110.37	110.37	110.37	441.49	
Under Story			25.70	27.06	28.67	25.02	106.42	
Down Dead Wood			58.93	58.93	58.93	58.93	235.73	
Forest Floor			303.96	303.96	303.96	303.96	1215.90	
Soil			736.45	736.45	736.45	736.45	2945.96	
Total Non Soil			1,319.50	1,089.29	912.61	597.86	3919.25	
TOTAL (MWh)			4901.84	4013.05	3328.86	2118.63	10784.38	MWh/ton/acre

Table 21: Illinois Claypan Region MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon Production Available

Forest-type group	Site Productivity Class						Total	% of Total
	225+ cubic feet/acre/y ear (1)	165-224 cubic feet/acre/y ear (2)	120-164 cubic feet/acre/y ear (3)	85-119 cubic feet/acre/y ear (4)	50-84 cubic feet/acre/y ear (5)	20-49 cubic feet/acre/y ear (6)		
Oak / hickory (500)	--	24,054	105,034	343,246	371,512	107,205	951,051	0.77
Mean Volume			1,440.93	1,129.72	774.64	193.29	3538.63	
Live Tree			807.10	635.01	436.85	109.44	1988.44	
Dead Tree			38.43	28.54	18.74	4.41	90.11	
Under Story			26.30	28.46	31.96	35.13	121.85	
Down Dead Wood			73.65	61.73	52.97	94.27	282.62	
Forest Floor			103.54	67.03	53.37	65.66	289.59	
Soil			521.77	521.77	521.77	521.77	2087.06	
Total Non Soil			103.54	820.71	593.81	308.90	1826.95	
TOTAL (MWh)			3115.29	3292.97	2484.15	1332.86	6686.65	MWh/ton/acre
Maple / beech / birch (800)	--	--	--	9,775	12,849	--	22,624	0.02
Mean Volume			1,495.54	1,100.53	612.15	134.46	3342.69	
Live Tree			803.66	592.77	330.66	81.59	1808.70	
Dead Tree			74.79	73.92	68.76	31.55	249.02	
Under Story			25.25	26.66	29.47	25.37	106.77	
Down Dead Wood			58.77	58.77	58.77	58.77	234.82	
Forest Floor			301.14	301.14	301.14	301.14	1204.55	
Soil			736.45	736.45	736.45	736.45	2945.96	
Total Non Soil			4,908.61	1,091.19	788.84	498.4	7287.04	
TOTAL (MWh)			8404.20	3981.43	2926.21	1867.72	13836.87	MWh/ton/acre

Table 22: Southern Illinois Region & Illinois Claypan Region MWh/Ton/Acre of Carbon Production Available

region_id	name	plant_count	energy_2007	fossil_2007	intensity_2007	Intensity (MWh/to carbon_2007		Energy			
								10%	15%	20%	30%
3672	Clay	2	3744.1599	0	1762.344	0.881172	3299.248	374.416	561.624	748.832	1123.248
3687	Clinton	3	401.1774	0	2103.124	1.051562	421.8628	40.11774	60.17661	80.23548	120.3532
3736	Crawford	2	917862	0.9835	2423.4189	1.21170945	1112182	91786.2	137679.3	183572.4	275358.6
3747	Cumberland	1	7838.5449	0	1591.2791	0.79563955	6236.6572	783.8545	1175.782	1567.709	2351.563
3845	Effingham	2	136871.0938	0.5367	955.8636	0.4779318	65415.0586	13687.11	20530.66	27374.22	41061.33
3879	Fayette	1	7970	0	1112.2629	0.55613145	4432.3662	797	1195.5	1594	2391
3905	Franklin	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4020	Hamilton	1	77.8073	0	2666.364	1.333182	103.7314	7.78073	11.6711	15.56146	23.34219
4136	Jackson	2	550161.125	0.7032	1191.0959	0.59554795	327647.3125	55016.11	82524.17	110032.2	165048.3
4147	Jasper	1	8839558	0	2159.478	1.079739	9544417	883955.8	1325934	1767912	2651867
4365	Madison	8	3482223	0.9978	1851.8621	0.92593105	3224299	348222.3	522333.5	696444.6	1044667
4388	Marion	1	19829	0	1349.439	0.6747195	13379.0195	1982.9	2974.35	3965.8	5948.7
4411	Massac	2	8954309	0	2089.5601	1.04478005	9355283	895430.9	1343146	1790862	2686293
4484	Monroe	1	314.9276	0	1836.931	0.9184655	289.2502	31.49276	47.23914	62.98552	94.47828
4493	Montgomery	2	6199564	0	2127.9551	1.06397755	6596197	619956.4	929934.6	1239913	1859869
4657	Perry	1	181613	0	1375.941	0.6879705	124944.3984	18161.3	27241.95	36322.6	54483.9
4733	Randolph	2	14300000	0	1978.582	0.989291	14100000	1430000	2145000	2860000	4290000
4801	Saint Clair	3	5716.0029	0.0681	723.0921	0.36154605	2066.5979	571.6003	857.4004	1143.201	1714.801
5078	Washington	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5104	Wayne	1	296.0298	0	1681.921	0.8409605	248.9493	29.60298	44.40447	59.20596	88.80894
5134	White	2	559.9966	0	1649.7629	0.82488145	461.931	55.99966	83.99949	111.9993	167.999
5149	Williamson	2	1937591	0	2805.2251	1.40261255	2717690	193759.1	290638.7	387518.2	581277.3

region_id	name	intensity				Carbon			
		10%	15%	20%	30%	10%	15%	20%	30%
3672	Clay	0.0881172	0.132176	0.176234	0.264352	329.9248	494.8872	659.8496	989.7744
3687	Clinton	0.1051562	0.157734	0.210312	0.315469	42.18628	63.27942	84.37256	126.5588
3736	Crawford	0.121170945	0.181756	0.242342	0.363513	111218.2	166827.3	222436.4	333654.6
3747	Cumberland	0.079563955	0.119346	0.159128	0.238692	623.6657	935.4986	1247.331	1870.997
3845	Effingham	0.04779318	0.07169	0.095586	0.14338	6541.506	9812.259	13083.01	19624.52
3879	Fayette	0.055613145	0.08342	0.111226	0.166839	443.2366	664.8549	886.4732	1329.71
3905	Franklin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4020	Hamilton	0.1333182	0.199977	0.266636	0.399955	10.37314	15.55971	20.74628	31.11942
4136	Jackson	0.059554795	0.089332	0.11911	0.178664	32764.73	49147.1	65529.46	98294.19
4147	Jasper	0.1079739	0.161961	0.215948	0.323922	954441.7	1431663	1908883	2863325
4365	Madison	0.092593105	0.13889	0.185186	0.277779	322429.9	483644.9	644859.8	967289.7
4388	Marion	0.06747195	0.101208	0.134944	0.202416	1337.902	2006.853	2675.804	4013.706
4411	Massac	0.104478005	0.156717	0.208956	0.313434	935528.3	1403292	1871057	2806585
4484	Monroe	0.09184655	0.13777	0.183693	0.27554	28.92502	43.38753	57.85004	86.77506
4493	Montgomery	0.106397755	0.159597	0.212796	0.319193	659619.7	989429.6	1319239	1978859
4657	Perry	0.06879705	0.103196	0.137594	0.206391	12494.44	18741.66	24988.88	37483.32
4733	Randolph	0.0989291	0.148394	0.197858	0.296787	1410000	2115000	2820000	4230000
4801	Saint Clair	0.036154605	0.054232	0.072309	0.108464	206.6598	309.9897	413.3196	619.9794
5078	Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5104	Wayne	0.08409605	0.126144	0.168192	0.252288	24.89493	37.3424	49.78986	74.68479
5134	White	0.082488145	0.123732	0.164976	0.247464	46.1931	69.28965	92.3862	138.5793
5149	Williamson	0.140261255	0.210392	0.280523	0.420784	271769	407653.5	543538	815307

Table 23: Fossil Fuel Usage in Illinois for Energy Production

Southern Illinois Oak-Hickory Group




Figure 1: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois

Illinois Claypan Oak-Hickory Group




Figure 2: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois

Southern Illinois & Illinois Claypan Oak-Hickory Group




Figure 3: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois

Illinois Claypan Maple-Beech-Birch Group




Figure 4: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois

Southern Illinois & Illinois Claypan Maple-Beech-Birch Group




Figure 5: Hex map of Total Aboveground Carbon (metric tons/hectare) for Illinois

Table 5. Average Feedstock Demand Prices by Utilities

Scenario and Residue	U.S. Dollars per Dry Ton			
	2% Cofire		15% Cofire	
	Farmgate Feedstock Demand Price ^a	Delivered Feedstock Demand Price ^b	Farmgate Feedstock Demand Price	Delivered Feedstock Demand Price
<i>NoClax:</i>				
Agriculture residues	NA ^a	NA	NA	NA
Forest	\$24.66	\$28.48	NA	NA
Mill waste	\$23.67	\$28.86	NA	NA
Dedicated crop	NA	NA	NA	NA
Urban waste	\$21.96	\$27.98	NA	NA
<i>LowClax:</i>				
Agriculture residues	\$54.79	\$57.07	\$46.41 ^d	\$58.25
Forest	\$53.48	\$58.46	\$40.13	\$60.60
Mill waste	\$54.29	\$57.97	\$40.18	\$60.63
Dedicated crop	\$54.91	\$55.85	\$42.71	\$59.29
Urban waste	\$54.92	\$56.07	\$41.70	\$59.20
<i>HighClax:</i>				
Agriculture residues	\$55.00	\$57.72	\$55.00	\$61.29
Forest	\$55.00	\$58.46	\$55.00	\$64.22
Mill waste	\$55.00	\$58.10	\$55.00	\$64.28
Dedicated crop	\$55.00	\$58.54	\$55.00	\$63.71
Urban waste	\$55.00	\$58.30	\$55.00	\$62.45

^a Farmgate feedstock demand price is the average price the utility would be willing to pay the supplier given the scenario and cost of other feedstocks and the costs involved in transporting, handling, and on-site storage.

^b Delivered feedstock demand price determined based on information from ORIBAS and includes transportation, handling, and on-site storage costs.

^c NA is none available at the estimated value.

^d A much larger quantity of residues would be demanded by power plants resulting in increased transportation costs and increased investment costs resulting in a lower feedstock demand price.

(English, B.C., K. Jensen, J. Menard, M. E. Walsh, C. Brandt, J. Van Dyke, S. Hadley.
2007)

Figure 6: Average Feedstock Demand Prices.

VITA

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Alison Mae Britt

ambritt26@yahoo.com

Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Bachelor of Science, Agribusiness Economics, May 2008

Research Paper Title:

Woody Biomass: A Renewable Resource for Southern Illinois

Major Professor: Silvia Secchi